

#12
ant
2/18/04

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 11 2004
OFFICIAL

Applicant: Steven R. Kursh
Application No.: 09/729,664 Group: 2654
Filed: December 4, 2000 Examiner: Daniel A. Nolan
Confirmation No.: 6351
For: COMPUTER ACCOUNTING METHOD USING NATURAL
LANGUAGE SPEECH RECOGNITION

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P O Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, or is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on:	
<u>2/11/04</u>	<u>Margaret A. Norcott</u>
Date	Signature
<u>Margaret A. Norcott</u>	
Typed or printed name of person signing certificate	

SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY AND STATUS INQUIRY

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The following is in response an Advisory Action dated January 12, 2004 in the above-referenced patent application.

Applicant notes that the last received Office Action (Paper No. 8) dated September 17, 2003 is not a Final Office Action. That is, there is no indication on the Office Action papers as received by Applicant that a final rejection was issued.

In response to the Office Action dated 9/17/03, Applicant duly filed a response on December 17, 2003.

-2-

Subsequently Applicant received an Advisory Action (Paper No. 10) dated 1/12/04. The Advisory Action indicates that "THE REPLY FILED 22 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE." However, no such reply was filed in February 2003 by Applicant and no such prior Office Action received by Applicant placed the application under final rejection. Thus, Applicant's attorney telephoned Examiner Daniel Nolan on January 15, 2004. In a return phone call on January 16, 2004, Examiner Nolan indicated that he was out of town but would be back in town on the following Tuesday, January 20, 2004 and that he would look into matters at that time.

Applicant's attorney has not heard further with regard to status of the subject patent application, and in particular with regard to status of the September 17, 2003 Office Action being non-final as stated throughout those papers (Paper No. 8).

Lastly, Applicant requests that in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office records any indication of the subject application being under final rejection be corrected as this appears to be in error.